

77. (Amended) The adhesive film strip composite according to claim 73, wherein said adhesive film strip and/or said second adhesive film strip is elastically or plastically extensible due to the presence of an intermediate support.

78. (Amended) In a method comprising bonding an adhesive film strip to a substrate, and optionally thereafter releasing said adhesive film strip from said substrate by pulling on said adhesive film strip in the direction of the plane of the bond formed between said adhesive film strip and said substrate, the improvement which comprises employing as said adhesive film strip the adhesive film strip according to any one of claims 68-71, 72, 73-76, and 77.

79. (Amended) The method according to claim 78, wherein said substrate is non-planar.

80. (Amended) The method according to claim 79, wherein said non-planar substrate is convex.

81. (Amended) The method according to claim 79, wherein said non-planar substrate is irregular.

---

### **Remarks**

#### **I.**

Claims 68-81 are presently active in the application. Claims 1-67 have been canceled.

#### **II.**

Applicants' representatives James R. Boler and Charles L. Gholz thank Examiner Ahmad for the courtesy of granting an interview on April 17, 2001. The outstanding rejections were discussed. At the interview, the examiner continued to assert that at least claims 70, 73, and 75 are indefinite for the reasons stated in the office action even though the language used in those claims was copied from corresponding claims of the Hazes U.S.

Patent No. 6,086,973 (hereinafter referred to as "the '973 patent") --i.e., the patent with which the applicants are attempting to provoke an interference. Thus, claims 70, 73, and 75 have been amended to overcome the indefiniteness noted by the examiner. In addition, the format of claim 68 has been changed to more clearly set forth the recitations in paragraph a).

The pulling force F shown in Fig. 7 and described on page 15 lines 20-31, as discussed below, provides adequate support for the recitation in claim 68 of "by pulling on the adhesive film in the direction of the plane of the bond" to overcome the 35 USC 112, first paragraph rejection on the ground of new matter.

Minor formatting amendments and/or clarification of the antecedents have been made in the remaining claims in order to further clarify the claimed subject matter even though these claims were not rejected by the examiner under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

### III.

Claims 68-81 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as lacking an adequate written description. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The examiner contends that the recitation in claim 68 of "by pulling on the adhesive [film] strip in the direction of the plane of the bond formed between said adhesive [film] strip and said substrate" includes new matter. The examiner stated that he could not find support for the noted recitation on page 28 line 27 - page 28 line 3 of the specification that was referred to by the applicants. The examiner further noted "[h]owever, [the] specification, page 27, lines 27+ refers to stretching at a low angle but fails to recite 'in the direction of the plane of the bond[']."

The examiner's attention is further directed to Fig. 7 of the drawings. That figure clearly shows that the pulling force F is applied in the direction of the plane of the bond

between the adhesive film strip 132 and the substrate 52. The structure illustrated in Fig. 7 is described on page 15 lines 20-31. The pulling force F shown in Fig. 7 is directed in the plane of the bond just as the pulling forces B and C are directed in the planes of the bonds shown in Fig. 2 of the '973 patent.

Thus, applicants submit that the recitation cited by the examiner is adequately supported by the original specification, and they respectfully request that the rejection of claims 68-81 under the first paragraph of 35 USC 112 be withdrawn.

#### IV.

Claims 68-81 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The examiner first stated that the phrase "which" in claim 68 line 5 is deemed to be confusing because it is not clear if the phrase refers to the adhesive film strip or to the composite. Claim 68 has been reformatted, and as reformatted the word "which" considered indefinite by the examiner clearly refers to the "adhesive film strip" defined in paragraph a). As rewritten, applicants submit that claim 68 fully complies with the second paragraph of 35 USC 112.

The examiner next contended that claims 70 and 75 are vague regarding the location of the "tab(s)" with respect to each of the strips. To overcome this rejection, applicants have amended claims 70 and 75 to clarify that the claimed tab or tabs are at one end of the film strip. Thus, applicants respectfully submit that claims 70 and 75 of the present application now also comply with the second paragraph of 35 USC 112.

The examiner next contended that, in claim 73 line 2, the phrase "a plurality of mating loop or hook fasteners" is deemed to be indefinite for the reason that it is not clear if the phrase refers to a new fastener or to the fastener recited in claim 68 line 10. To overcome the

rejection, applicants have changed claim 73 line 2 to delete "a" and insert --the--.


Accordingly, claim 73 should likewise be deemed allowable under the second paragraph of 35 USC 112.

Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 68-81 under the second paragraph of 35 USC 112 be withdrawn.

V.

In view of the above remarks, applicants submit that claims 68-81 are allowable under the first and second paragraphs of 35 USC 112. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request the examiner to forward the present application and the file of the '973 patent to the Board for the declaration of an interference.

Respectfully submitted,



James R. Boler, Esq.  
Registration No. 37,058  
OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P. C.  
1755 Jefferson Davis Highway, 4<sup>th</sup> Fl.  
Arlington, Virginia 22202  
(703) 412-6262 (telephone)  
(703) 413-2220 (facsimile)  
JBOLER@OBLON.COM



**22850**

Of Counsel

Charles L. Gholz, Esq.  
Registration No. 26,395  
OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P. C.  
1755 Jefferson Davis Highway, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Arlington, Virginia 22202  
(703) 412-6485 (direct dial)  
(703) 413-2220 (facsimile)  
CCHOLZ@OBLON.COM (e-mail)

Of Counsel

Charles L. Gholz, Esq.  
Registration No. 26,395  
OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P. C.  
1755 Jefferson Davis Highway, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Arlington, Virginia 22202  
(703) 412-6485 (direct dial)  
(703) 413-2220 (facsimile)  
CCHOLZ@OBLON.COM (e-mail)

David B. Patchett, Esq.  
Registration No. 39,326  
3M  
Office of Intellectual Property  
P.O. Box 33427  
St. Paul, MN 55133-3427  
(651) 736-4713